

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

CHARLES B. HILL, JR.,)
))
 Plaintiff,))
))
v.)) No. 08 C 1917
))
COUNTY OF COOK, et al.,))
))
 Defendant.))

MEMORANDUM ORDER

This Court has just received its chambers copies of two 29-page Answers to the Second Amended Complaint filed by Charles Hill, Jr. ("Hill"): Dkt. 70, an Answer on behalf of what appear to be all defendants other than Sheriff Thomas Dart and Dkt. 71, an Answer on behalf of Sheriff Dart. Unsurprisingly, not only are all defendants represented by State's Attorney Anita Alvarez, but the same Assistant State's Attorney has prepared and filed both documents.

Only a moment's thought should have led defense counsel to have followed a different procedure than that made available by the existence of the ubiquitous computer. Had this case been filed in more ancient times, the lawyer's decision to require the preparation of two answers instead of one would no doubt have generated a bitter (and justified) complaint by a secretary forced to engage in such a needlessly repetitive process, and that complaint might have headed off the dual filing. But even without a complaint from such a source, counsel should have

realized that any reader who is required to see whether and to what extent different defendants might take differing positions--in this instance, Hill's counsel and this Court--ought to be favored with a single document rather than what has been tendered.

This Court understandably has no inclination, let alone the time, to undertake such a laborious task. In the interest of courtesy as well as efficiency, both Dkt. 70 and 71 are stricken, without prejudice of course to the prompt filing of a single Answer on behalf of all defendants.



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: September 20, 2010